



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MAY MEETING, 1905.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 11th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the President, CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, LL.D., in the chair.

The record of the Annual Meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian read the list of donors to the Library during the past month. Among the books was the first volume of the very thorough and elaborate "History of the United States" which has been long in preparation by a Resident Member, Mr. Edward Channing, Professor of History in Harvard University. The Librarian presented, in the name of Mr. Sidney L. Smith, of Boston, a copy of the large portrait of Charles W. Eliot, LL.D., recently engraved by him.

Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the "Atlantic Monthly," was elected a Resident Member; and M. Gabriel Hanotaux, of Paris, France, was elected a Corresponding Member.

Messrs. Edward J. Young, Alexander McKenzie, and Charles C. Smith were appointed a Committee to publish the Proceedings for the current year.

Messrs. Thornton K. Lothrop, S. Lothrop Thorndike, and Charles C. Smith were appointed a House Committee.

Messrs. Albert B. Hart and Roger B. Merriman were appointed a Committee to superintend the preparation of a Consolidated Index to the Second Series of the Proceedings.

On motion of the Treasurer it was

*Voted*, That the income of the Massachusetts Historical Trust-Fund for the last financial year be retained in the Treasury, to be applied to such purposes as the Council may direct.

THE PRESIDENT said that, while the ballots were in progress, and before communications from the regular section of the day were called for, certain matters could be disposed of.

He would, in the first place, call attention to an impression of the steel plate engraving from Marshall Johnson's painting

of the "Mayflower" which had recently been executed by John A. Lowell & Co. The painting was from the model of the "Mayflower" made by Captain J. W. Collins by order of the United States government, and now in the National Museum at Washington. At the time subscriptions for the engraving were invited, the President said he had put his name down for two copies, one a signed artist proof, with the Society in mind. He now presented it. The picture may claim to be a very correct and lifelike representation of the original "Mayflower," as she probably appeared when under full sail. As an engraving, the work must speak for itself; but it seemed eminently proper a copy should be in the possession of the Society.

Returning from a four months' absence, mainly in Africa, among a large accumulated mass of manuscript and printed matter, of greater or less value, — generally of less, — he had found three pamphlets of interest, which he desired to add to the collections of the Society; and, in so doing, he wished to make such mention of them as would insure a reference in the Index to the Proceedings. These pamphlets could thus, and thus only, have a chance of coming to the notice of investigators and students.

The first of the three was a paper by Albert Matthews, — a reprint from the New-England Historical and Genealogical Register of April, 1905, entitled "The Naming of Hull." The reference, of course, was to the town of Hull, in Massachusetts. This pamphlet, the President remarked, was of peculiar interest to him personally, inasmuch as it was directed to the correction of an error into which he had apparently fallen in editing, for the Prince Society, Thomas Morton's "New English Canaan." He there came across the statement that "Mr. Wethercock, a proper Mariner," and the commander of one of the ships which came to Boston in 1630, for certain reasons "was resolved to lie at Hull." He inferred, and so said, that the reference was to the locality at the mouth of Boston harbor then generally known as Nantaskot, but, in 1644, called Hull. Mr. Matthews, in this paper, maintains that "to lie at hull" was a seventeenth-century nautical term, signifying simply lying with no sail set. Morton accordingly, in making use of the term, did not mean to imply that the person he calls "Mr. Wethercock" anchored at

Hull, but merely that he, for certain reasons, laid-to his ship,—thought best “to beare no saile.”

Mr. Matthews supports this contention by an array of references and quotations which prove clearly that I here fell into an editorial error. I will frankly confess that, until I read Mr. Matthews’s pamphlet, I was not aware that any such expression as “lying at hull,” equivalent to “lying at anchor,” or “lying-to,” had ever been in use. Nevertheless, it is obvious such is the fact; and, moreover, though now obsolete, it was, as a form of nautical speech, in common use when Morton wrote.

Compelled to acknowledge both my ignorance and my error, I wish to put the correct reading on record,—a warning and example for all future editors. In so doing I have nothing to say in extenuation. In my over-confidence substituting a capital, I printed the word “Hull”; whereas, in the text of the copy of the “New English Canaan” from which I edited, it appeared correctly, “hull.”

Nevertheless, I am still strongly inclined to think that the inference I drew in the note to the Prince Society edition of the “New English Canaan” (p. 337) was correct,—that the locality since 1644 legally called Hull, at the entrance to Boston harbor, was generally known by mariners by the name it now bears long before it was so ordered by the General Court, May 29, 1644, “that Nantaskot shall be called Hull.” My reason for so thinking is that very many of the islands, promontories, etc., in and about Boston bay bore the names by which they have since been known years before Winthrop’s arrival and the definitive settlement. For instance, Squantum was so named by Standish on his first trip of exploration, in September, 1621. The Farm School Island, directly opposite, was then called the Island Trevore, and subsequently Thompson’s Island, the name it still bears. The Brewsters and Point Allerton were likewise so named at that time. Peddock’s Island, directly opposite Hull, is so designated by Morton; as also is Nut Island. Mount Wollaston got that name as early as 1625. This list might be considerably extended, but the foregoing will suffice for examples. My own belief is that the water inside Nantaskot, or Nantasket beach,—which, by the way, is another case in point,—was a favorite anchoring-ground for the vessels which every season frequented the bay

during the years preceding the settlement. The mariners visiting the coast were in the custom of there lying at hull, or lying at anchor. My theory is that the point became, therefore, known in common speech as Hull, or the anchorage ground, and subsequently the name was formally given to it. I must add, however, that I cannot adduce any direct evidence in support of this theory.

Mr. Matthews also calls attention to another fact in connection with the "New English Canaan" which had escaped my knowledge. He says, truly enough, that Morton is "nothing if not fanciful in the names he employs." In my notes to the "New English Canaan" I made no attempt to identify "Mr. Wethercock." Mr. Matthews now shows that by "Wethercock" was designated John Grant, the master of the ship "Handmaid," more than once referred to by Winthrop.

The next of the three pamphlets is a copy of the Annual Address before the Clinton (Massachusetts) Historical Society, by Jonathan Smith, the President of the Society, delivered September 14, 1903, entitled "Some Features of Shays's Rebellion." I regard this as a valuable and suggestive contribution to Massachusetts historical lore. More than one account of Shays's Rebellion has been written, especially that by Minot. But in all these accounts, so far as I know, that episode has been treated in the most superficial manner. No attempt has been made to go below the surface, and show what were the causes of the great unrest which then prevailed. The subject has been somewhat dealt with by our associate, Mr. Noble, and the material he found in the Suffolk County Court Records bearing upon the underlying causes of the uprising was developed in a paper read before the American Antiquarian Society at its October meeting, 1902, and printed in Vol. XV. of the New Series of the publications of that society. I chanced to be present at the meeting in question, and then ventured some remarks in connection with Mr. Noble's paper. To those remarks I would now refer.<sup>1</sup> I again had occasion to touch upon this matter in a note to the Newburyport diary of John Quincy Adams,<sup>2</sup> in which more than one reference appears to Shays and his followers. I then called attention to the ex-

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, at the annual meeting held in Worcester, October 21, 1902, New Series, vol. xv. pp. 114-120.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Proceedings (November, 1902), vol. xvi. p. 342 n.

treme popular odium into which the legal profession had fallen in connection with the great distress which prevailed throughout Massachusetts and New England as a consequence of the War of Independence. Mr. Smith, in the pamphlet a copy of which I now submit, takes, as the result of a very thorough investigation of the court records, etc., the view of Shays's insurrection which I believe to be the correct one. I wish to call attention to his paper as of real historical value.

The third of these pamphlets is one by Robert Bingham, master of the Bingham School, Ashville, North Carolina, entitled "Sectional Misunderstandings," being a reprint of an article in the "North American Review" for September, 1904, with material added.

This pamphlet also has, in my judgment, a distinct and permanent historical value. The Society may remember that, two years ago, at the February meeting, I submitted, with some preliminary remarks, a copy of an address I had recently delivered before the New England Society of Charleston, South Carolina, entitled "The Constitutional Ethics of Secession."<sup>1</sup> In a note to this address I called attention to the fact that the right of secession had been clearly set forth by William Rawle, in his publication (1825) entitled "View of the Constitution."<sup>2</sup> This treatise was a text-book used at West Point Military Academy at the time Robert E. Lee, Joseph E. Johnston, and other Confederate leaders were cadets there. The fact that it was so used, asserted by me, is now clearly established by Mr. Bingham. The genesis of the opposite theory — that is, the contention of our associate, Governor Chamberlain,<sup>3</sup> that the constitutional right of secession not only never existed, but was never claimed to exist until a comparatively recent period — is still worthy of study. There can be no doubt that the power of practical nullification was claimed by Mr. Webster as late as 1813.<sup>4</sup> There is equally no doubt that the right of any State to secede from the Union was asserted as a matter that did not admit of denial by William Rawle in 1825. The right of nullification, as we all know, was subsequently not only claimed, but put in practice by

<sup>1</sup> 2 Proceedings, vol. xvii. pp. 90-116.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. xvi. pp. 151-173.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. xvii. p. 111 n.; Van Tyne, *The Letters of Daniel Webster*, p. 67.

South Carolina in November, 1832. The counter doctrine found its first emphatic expression in Webster's reply to Hayne, made in 1830; and, finally, was elaborated by Story in his "Commentaries on the Constitution," published in 1833. The position taken by Rawle was therein specifically and emphatically controverted, and the more recent constitutional view of Webster developed. Nevertheless, some days since, in re-reading Mr. Morley's "Life of Cobden," I came across this very interesting extract from a letter of Richard Cobden's to W. Hargreaves, Esq., under date of June 22, 1861, the first summer of our Civil War. It is entitled "Tocqueville on the Right of Secession," and reads as follows:—

"I am glad to see that as yet there is no serious fighting in America. Until there has been a bloody collision, one may hope there will be none. I have been reading Tocqueville's 'Democracy in America.' In his chapter on the influence of slavery his sagacity is, as it frequently is, quite prophetic. He seems to regard it as the chief danger to the Union, less from the rival interests it creates, than from the incompatibility of manners which it produces. It is singular, too, that he takes the Southern view of the right of secession. He says, 'The Union was formed by the voluntary agreement of the States; and in uniting together they have not forfeited their nationality, nor have they been reduced to one and the same people. If one of the States chose to withdraw its name from the contract, it would be difficult to disprove its right of doing so; and the Federal Government would have no means of maintaining its claims either by force or by right.' He then goes on to argue that among the States united by the Federal tie there may be some which have a great interest in maintaining the Union on which their prosperity depends; and he then remarks—'Great things may then be done in the name of the Federal Government, but in reality that Government will have ceased to exist.' Has he not accurately anticipated both the fact and the motive of the present attitude of the State of New York? Is it not commercial gain and mercantile ascendancy which prompt their warlike zeal for the Federal Government? At all events, it is a little unreasonable in the New York politicians to require *us* to treat the South as rebels, in the face of the opinion of our highest European authority as to the right of secession."<sup>1</sup>

It is perfectly true that neither Tocqueville nor Cobden was an authority on questions of law, or construction, arising under the Constitution of the United States. Nevertheless,

<sup>1</sup> Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden* (ed. 1881), vol. ii. pp. 385, 386.

Tocqueville unquestionably was an authority of the first order as respects any general understanding as to the construction of that Constitution prevailing at the period he wrote. Therefore, when Tocqueville says, as he does in the extract I have quoted, that the Union was formed by voluntary agreement of the States, and that, in forming this agreement, they none of them forfeited their nationality, and that, if one of the States withdrew its name from the contract, it would be difficult to disprove its right so to do, it is clear Tocqueville expressed an opinion then generally entertained. Tocqueville, it will be remembered, wrote in 1835-40, several years after the Nullification Act of South Carolina, and after Story published his "Commentaries." The statement of so eminent a foreign authority on this extremely interesting point cannot well be ignored. He was a thoughtful and correct observer. I am glad to add this citation to those I collected and made part of my Charleston Address of 1903.

Mr. WILLIAM R. THAYER read the following paper: —

*The Outlook in History.*

What is History? The thing we know; the definition baffles us. But what is Truth — or Beauty — or Poetry? The wisest have not yet agreed on a formula for any one of them; nor is this strange: for Poetry and Beauty, History and Truth, spring from the unfathomed sources of life, from the mystery which, although it be for each of us the only vital reality, eludes all our research. But as we manage to live without solving the riddle, — indeed, the acceptance of its insolubility seems to be the only solution, — so we waive a final definition of History, and go on to consider some of its aspects.

The present time is particularly favorable for a survey, because we have apparently reached a point where historians pursuing different aims are producing side by side, in mutual tolerance, if not in mutual respect. This is a hopeful sign. Progress requires variation; orthodoxy leads to bigotry, persecution, paralysis.

The modern scientific method of studying history has now been practised in France, England, and America for more than a generation, and in Germany for two or three decades longer. It has passed beyond the tentative stage, survived



ridicule and opposition, and risen to acknowledged supremacy. In its complete triumph there was danger that it might become a fetish. But now we begin to see that every method is merely a tool, and that the product of the tool depends on the skill of its user. No refinement of mechanism can take the place of human insight and character. The results of a victory won by an army equipped with rapid-fire, long-range guns may sink into insignificance compared with what Norman William's crossbows achieved at Hastings, or Washington's flintlocks won at Yorktown. So neither Justin Winsor nor Mandell Creighton, enjoying to the full the advantages of the modern method, ranks with Thucydides or Tacitus, or with many lesser men, who flourished in the "unscientific" ages. Something more than a system goes to the making of great histories. This recognition of personality as the cornerstone on which everything human rests is the beginning of wisdom.

German historical students, under Ranke's lead, had firmly established themselves in the scientific method, when the general adoption of the doctrine of evolution forced historians everywhere to take a new point of view. To trace causes and effects had long been their purpose; now they saw that the principle of growth, or development, was itself the very rudiment of causation. They proceeded to rearrange their material, and to rewrite the story of every nation, institution, art, and science according to this principle. No other formula has been so fruitful, or so universally applicable; nor do we now see how it can be superseded.

To historians especially, the doctrine of development came as a revelation, which made the work of their pre-Darwinian forerunners appear as obsolete as the ancient religions appeared to the first Christians. They felt the delight which thrills those who exercise a new faculty; say, rather, the exaltation of those who dedicate themselves to a new crusade for Truth. As always happens in such cases, they strove by every means to magnify the difference between the New and the Old; as if the New were wholly right, and the Old wholly wrong. This is a wise instinct; for only when a novel doctrine or cult is pushed to its extreme can we measure its intrinsic value, and determine how much of its apparent strength is due to mere reaction or contrast.

We now look back on the products of forty years of the modern historical school. Comparing them with the great works of the past, two facts strike us at once: There has been a gain in method, and a loss in literary quality. The gain in method shows itself chiefly in accuracy and in a studied impartiality: the loss in literary quality can be verified by tasting an average historical monograph. The scientific historian had formerly the same feeling toward the literary historian as the early Christians had toward the culture of Greece and Rome: believing that they themselves possessed the true gospel, they wished to show their orthodoxy by being as different as possible from the pagans. History had come to be regarded as literature, they would leave no room for doubt that they regarded it as science. In the scientific world the view prevailed — and it has not wholly disappeared — that to write intelligibly is suspicious, while to write “popularly” is suicidal; and this, despite the fact that Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and Mill — the most illustrious men of science of their generation — had set a noble example in clear expression.

Historical students shared this distrust of literary form, and as their investigations followed the scientific pattern, their reports naturally took the shape of the scientific treatise. Several causes have contributed to make the scientific treatise what it is. First of all, it is usually written by an investigator or observer who has no aptitude for expression, — for the highest powers of observation do not necessarily go with even ordinary capacity for expression. Next, the immense numbers of facts and processes discovered by Science during the past half-century have required the invention of thousands of new terms, until each science has a special dialect, which is often as hopeless for literary purposes as is algebraic notation. No wonder that men whose minds swarm with awkward vocabularies, — formed, by a cruel irony, from mongrel combinations of the most beautiful of languages (as if the Apollo Belvedere were ground into powder to make stucco), — no wonder that they distrust those who show ability to use the mother-tongue, which tends in a way to become foreign to them. Scientific men also scorned to suit their language to any persons except their fellow initiates, thereby illustrating that tendency to exclusiveness which appears in freemasonry, college secret societies, and sectarian mysteries.

Nor must we overlook another very powerful influence. Throughout most of the nineteenth century the Germans set the standard of scholarship. The world has never seen other diggers so tireless, so patient, so zealous. They have made their minds, as instruments of observation, almost as precise and impersonal as a microscope. They accumulate facts by the million; they would cross the ocean to certify a comma. Through their devotion to truth, through their rugged honesty, they have worthily represented the great German race, which lags, on the political side, so far behind its ideals. But to their scholarship, power of expression has been, it seems, denied. They have had to struggle against not only the difficulties inherent in the creation of new sciences and in the accumulation of knowledge, but also against the refractoriness of their speech. If a language be the expression of a nation's habitual mental processes, German prose bears witness to a race which has had the habit of thinking widely and deeply, but not clearly. A German's statement may be compared to a charge of birdshot, which scatters, and in scattering may hit the target, and much else besides; while a Frenchman's statement, like the ball of the sharpshooter, goes straight to the bull's-eye.

All these various influences — the scientific method, literary inexperience, contempt for unprofessional criticism, devotion to the new gospel, and zealous imitation of the German model — helped to establish the idea that history must be unliterary if it would guard its reputation for authority. The German practice of publishing doctors' dissertations contributed further to encourage the belief that historical composition meant merely the pitchforking together of the results of special investigation. These results were often valuable, but who could expect that young men of twenty-four or twenty-five, who had given little or no heed to the manner of presentation, should write well? And having found that that sort of thing sufficed, they naturally were at no pains to improve on it in their later work. Nothing is more dangerous for a young man of ability than to suppose that the standard by which he wins his first academic success is final. For a good many years, much of the historical work produced in England and America smacked of the average doctor's dissertation. Since the study and writing of history seem to be coming more and

more to be restricted to university teachers, it is most important that they should look jealously to the manner as well as to the matter of their candidates' work: for in fifteen or twenty years these candidates will themselves be the arbiters of historic production.

The opinion which many upheld that history is a science increased their desire to make it resemble the sciences in all respects. The question, Is history a science? round which much controversy has raged, is not yet settled; but it apparently has reduced itself to a dispute over terms. The confusion arises from assuming that a subject becomes a science when it is studied by the scientific method. But before history can be a science, men must possess the gift of prophecy. Your chemist or physicist deals with forces and elements which are absolutely determinable at all times and places and under all conditions. Water will be composed of two molecules of hydrogen and one of oxygen until the earth drops into the sun. But the historian has to do with a chain of causation in which the chief elements—the human Will and Chance—are absolutely incomputable. Will remains a mystery. We cannot predict when it will manifest itself in individuals or in multitudes, nor can we set any limits to its activity. And so with Chance. After the event, it may be possible to trace the steps that led to it, but until it happens, no one suspects that it is near. Five minutes before Lincoln was shot, who dreamt of the calamity which was to shatter Reconstruction and alter the course of American history? Cavour dies, after a brief illness, and the unification of Italy is permanently turned awry. Thus Chance mocks us.

Our knowledge of all past history does not enable us to foresee what to-morrow will bring forth. We can generalize; and many a historian mistakes his generalizations for laws, but they may fit no special event. Now the special events, due to the human Will or to Chance, make up history. Although you may have studied every recorded revolution, yet you cannot foretell what peculiar turn the next outbreak in Paris may take from hour to hour: for you cannot know beforehand how the persons concerned in any affair may react on each other or on the masses; much less can you predict what Chance may bring about. It would be idle to call arithmetic a science if twice two were three yesterday, four to-day, and possibly five or

seven to-morrow. Yet similar variations are the staple of history. In human affairs, not less than in chemistry, given conditions would produce similar results, if you could get exactly the same personal ingredients. But this is impossible. Suppose Mirabeau had not died in 1791, — suppose Robespierre had been assassinated in 1792, — suppose a stray bullet had killed young Bonaparte at Toulon, — how would the course of events have been changed! Yet if the study of history were a science, it would convince us that Mirabeau's death was inevitable, and that Robespierre and Bonaparte in the very nature of things could not die in 1792. Manifestly, historians would be clairvoyants, as familiar with the future as with the past, the chosen confidants of Fate or Providence, if they could make any such assertions. We can say that Bonaparte did not die in 1792, but to affirm that he could not possibly have died would be absurd. Yet until history can demonstrate the *possible* as clearly as the *actual*, it will never be a valid science.

This does not, however, diminish its supreme importance, nor dull its interest; on the contrary, the uncertainty enhances both. We are not to infer that life is lawless, because we lack the gift of prophecy. Will, too, has its laws, although we cannot codify them. The historian's business is to trace the sequence of cause and effect so that every event, every deed, shall appear inevitable. If he succeed in doing that, he should rest content, and let teleology alone.

Were it not for Will, with its incomputable variations, mankind would be a sentient machine, and history would simply register the motions of automata. The consciousness of moral freedom alone gives dignity, charm, and significance to life. Although the fatalist may argue that this consciousness is a delusion we are fated to be the dupes of, the practical man will accept at its full value the most genuine of his experiences. Accordingly, the historian must write as if he were an eyewitness of the events he describes, so as to reproduce the plasticity, the uncertainty, the impression of a state of flux, which belong to the passing moment. Like the dramatist, he knows from the first scene the catastrophe of the last, but, instead of telling the secret, he lets the plot unfold itself, as if it were being lived out by the persons in the play. This quality, one of the rarest, if it be not the

very crown, of the historian's equipment, gives not merely the certitude of veracity, but of lifelikeness, which is the final test in reconstructing the past.

So far as the historian treats his subject in this fashion, he allows full scope to the free play of will; yet, as he really is not a contemporary, but a retrospective observer, he can also trace each link in the chain of causation and show its fatal or inevitable nature. In other words, he treats the Past as if it were Present, in his efforts to bring it to life, and he treats it as Past, in his efforts to rationalize and interpret it. So he is at once a Dramatist and a Philosopher. Needless to say, few historians possess these gifts in equal proportion, while many rouse in us the suspicion that they have never conceived of the Past as having been once Present and alive. They regard human beings as abstractions, or as dummies on which to drape their theories. In striving to eliminate the personal equation, which has an inconvenient habit of upsetting theories, they become impersonal: but as Personality is the very stuff out of which human life and history are made, the more they get rid of it, the farther they remove from reality. In a perfect history we should have, as in *Hamlet* or *Othello*, the motives, the strokes of chance, and the resultant action, so revealed that one might read it for its plot, another for its information, a third for its philosophical bearing: for it would mirror the universality of human experience.

An immediate result of the acceptance of evolution was the spread of fatalism. Science could finally demonstrate that rigid laws govern the material universe, including the bodies of men. By implication, man's will and spirit were equally fate-bound. Historians, imbued with this conviction, naturally ignored the individual, and devoted themselves to tracing the operation of laws in the development of nations and institutions. Great men seemed to them "negligible" quantities. Slowly, however, a change has come about. Recognition of the omnipresence of law has not lessened, but there has grown up what I may call a common-sense view of human freedom. The will is recognized as a force so mysterious and unpredictable that, though it doubtless obeys laws which we have not yet defined, still, for practical purposes, we must regard it as free. So Personality is coming again into the foreground of history. This involves a radical change in treatment, for per-

sons have to be described as alive and concrete, with individual flavor and surprises, and not as abstract and mechanical.

By another natural process, history has come back to literature. The assumption that the historical monograph, being a "scientific" product, might be put together regardless of form, has been fully tested, and has broken down. The analogy between the historical and the scientific monograph proves to be illusory. The biologist, or other pure scientist, must use the dialect of his science in order to be understood by his special tribe: nay, he may dispense with language altogether, and employ diagrams, symbols, and formulas. But the historian's theme is intensely human, and demands to be expressed in human terms. He is concerned with narration, exposition, description, argument, all of which are governed by literary laws to which he must conform. He may protest that he is "scientific," and refuse to be bound by the canons of literature, but he might as well refuse to be bound by the law of gravity; willy-nilly, he must master the art of literary expression if he would make his historical attainments effective.

In the first flush of the scientific dispensation, workers in every branch of history seemed equally inspired; and of a truth, their labors were equally useful. But gradually they have classified themselves according to the nature of their work and the talents required for it,—in one class the Men of the Letter, in the other the Men of the Spirit. The master is always a revealer of significances: facts are not ideas. During the mid-period, when they seemed to be on the same level, there were inevitable misunderstandings: the man who dumped an immense amount of original research into an unreadable monograph felt aggrieved that the books of Fiske and Green had a large sale, while some "literary" historians, on the other hand, did scant justice to the patience and devotion of the delvers. Now, happily, as all realize that they are not competitors and that the work of each is honorable and necessary, the sense of unjust distinctions is dying out. But the Men of the Letter always far outnumber the Men of the Spirit, and there is ever present the danger that they will force their methods and their standards on the Men of the Spirit. So, to-day, Philology smothers Literature.

It does not follow that all historical works should be composed after a single plan. There are episodes which call for

special treatment, aspects which require that attention should be focused on them, to the exclusion of a complete or general survey. The immense expansion of knowledge in modern times has provided History with material as abundant as life itself. One science after another has encroached on its domain and tried to usurp its sovereign rights. Political Economy, Government, Sociology, Philosophy, Psychology, Comparative Religion, has each insisted that it alone can interpret the evolution of nations and of mankind, because, it pleads, the spring of human action lies in its field. The economist sees taxation and the supply and demand of commodities dominating men's collective action; the sociologist shows that the relations between classes and between capital and labor are of vital importance: and so with each specialist. But History has not been dethroned: far from it: the abler the attempt of the specialist to prove that his science includes History, the clearer the conclusion that History cannot be thus hemmed in. But all these efforts, and the flood of new knowledge which has been pouring in from every side during the past half-century, have immensely enriched the province of History. The historian can never know too much of any of these or other sciences. He will often appeal to them to explain special events: but he must beware against surrendering his human point of view for that of any specialist. Whatever branch of his art he may practise, let him never forget to be human.

By these stages historical study has risen above polemics and technicalities. We seem to be approaching the happy moment when historical writers are to enjoy the fullest freedom. They have at command inexhaustible stores of material. As the gathering and sorting of documents draw to completion, the demand increases for those who can write; and, since absolutely no period or episode has been exhausted, historians have a limitless field to work in. There is a recognized division of labor among them. They need no longer waste time trying to persuade a doubting generation that the scientific method is the best, or that, since the life of individuals, nations, society, and the human race is a development, so the historian must be an evolutionist: everybody now assents to both propositions. What the world now awaits is results. For, after all, the world, which bothers itself very little about abstruse theories, judges by the concrete product.



Mr. FRANKLIN B. SANBORN said he had a brief communication to make concerning two practising physicians in Massachusetts and New Hampshire in the early colonial period, who had been rather overlooked by the writers on medical practice in New England in the seventeenth century, — Dr. Henry Greenland and Dr. Walter Barefoot. But before stating their case, he would remark, in regard to the French “American Farmer” St. John de Crèveœur, briefly mentioned in a former meeting, that he had been indirectly put in communication with one of his descendants, the only representative of the family now in France, and the son of St. John’s biographer, Robert St. John de Crèveœur. From this source he expected to receive for the Society a copy of the “American Farmer’s” biography, and perhaps some of the inedited manuscripts in possession of the family in Paris. Mr. Sanborn then said : —

Henry Greenland, “chirurgion,” first appeared in Massachusetts early in 1662, establishing himself in practice at Newbury, and very near the Merrimac River, in what is now Newburyport. Upon inquiry by the town officers, he stated that he had come there in order to be near his intimate friend, Dr. Walter Barefoot, then in medical practice at Dover, New Hampshire, and along the banks of the Pascataqua ; that his wife Mary would come over from England later (as she did), and that he would temporarily make Newbury his New England home. He did so until 1666, or thereabout, when he removed to Kittery in Maine, then seeking, by the aid of Charles Second’s commissioners, Carr, Cartwright, Maverick, and Nichols, to become a Province independent of Massachusetts, which claimed jurisdiction. In the previous year he was the subject of a singular agreement made by three of these commissioners, July 17-24, 1665, at Portsmouth, quoted in my History of New Hampshire, p. 72, and running thus : —

“We do hereby testify that we do freely forgive Mr. Richard Cutt of Portsmouth, concerning any injury which he might be supposed to have done us by some words which he was accused to have spoken against the King’s Commissioners (about having a dagger put into their bellies or guts) or words to the like purpose. And if the said Cutt never molest Thomas Wiggin of Dover, or Dr. Greenland of Newbury, for giving in evidence against him, or for reporting him to be the

author of such words, we promise never to produce those writings and evidences which they have sworn before us, to his hurt or damage."

This Thomas Wiggin was the brother-in-law of Walter Barefoot, having married Sarah, his sister, from whom were descended the Masons who, in the eighteenth century, sold the claim of their family to the whole unoccupied lands of that Province; and also, in the nineteenth century, those Havens of Portsmouth, who in several ways distinguished themselves. Dr. Greenland was the intimate friend of Barefoot, and was associated with him in purchases and sales of land at Kittery, as well as in political opposition to the rule of the Puritans in Maine and New Hampshire; and five years later (1670) Greenland was charged with a very wicked attempt to bring his enemy, the wealthy Richard Cutt, to condign punishment in England for treason. In 1665 one of the three Commissioners wrote to England that the two Portsmouth brothers, John and Richard Cutt, "are thought to be worth no less than 50,000 pounds sterling; there is not one man in ten there but what are constantly in their debts." Bearing this opinion of their riches in mind, this evidence of Robert Gardner, taken before John Hunking at the Isles of Shoals, where an armed English vessel, the "Mermaiden," was then lying at hull, becomes important:—

"That Mr. Henry Greenland said unto him, the said Gardner, that he would put our ship's company upon a brave purchase; which should be by seizing on the person of Mr. Richard Cutt, and to carry him for England; and that it would be effected with a great deal of ease, by carrying the ship to Pascataway; and that a small number of our men might go and take himself, and cause him and his servants to carry down on their backs such money and goods as was there to be found. And he was sure the purchase would be worth ten thousand pounds; and he would maintain the doing thereof in point of law; for that the said Cutt had spoken treason against the king." (Court Records, May 27, 1670.)

Upon receiving information of this plot, Captain George Fountaine, of the "Mermaiden," wrote at once to Mr. Cutt, (May 28, 1670):—

Although unacquainted, I do kindly salute you. My present occasion of writing concerns so much your safety and my honor that I cannot delay any time to advise you thereof. For about five days past

there came on board of me one of your neighbors, by name Henry Greenland, who pretended some former acquaintance with some of my men, specially with one Gardner, whom he hath employed to speak to me concerning an unworthy design, as per the enclosed deposition you may know. But I would first tell you and the Country I would scorn to embrace or give ear to any such heinous intents; but in all respects to the utmost of my power, am ready to serve you and the rest of them. Had I been but sure that the law of the Country would excuse me, I would, in half an hour, hang the unworthy man that would fain, by promise of getting great purchase, corrupt me to my countrymen's harm, — which I will never do. What I have at present sent is desiring you to use your own will in following the law on this man: and maybe for your further safety. Pray let me hear from you by the 1st. My love to Major Shapleigh, Mr. Fryar and yourself.

Your faithful friend to command,

GEORGE FOUNTAINE.

No criminal proceedings seem to have been instituted against Dr. Greenland at the time, but two years later (June, 1672), the General Court of Massachusetts issued this order: —

“Henry Greenland appearing before this Court, and being legally convicted of many high misdemeanors, i. e. endeavoring to disturb his Majesty's government here settled, reviling the courts of justice and the magistrates in base and unworthy terms, and making quarrels and contentions among the people in a very perfidious manner, with profane cursing and swearing; is sentenced to pay a fine of Twenty Pounds in money, and to depart the limits of this jurisdiction within two months next coming, and not to return again without the license of the General Court or Council: On penalty of being severely whipt 30 stripes, and to pay a fine of 100 Pounds: and not to be admitted hereafter to be a surety or attorney in any legal process; and stand committed until the fine of Twenty Pounds be satisfied.”

The execution of this sentence was deferred until the next year, when Greenland with his wife Mary and his children departed for New Pascataway in New Jersey, — a plantation to which several of the residents along the New Hampshire Pascataqua and its branches had gone, and where he remained the rest of his life, so far as we know. There he became a prominent citizen and landholder, at whose house important meetings were held, and there he bore the titles of Captain and Justice of the Peace, as well as of Doctor, though it does not appear that he practised medicine there. He had prac-

tised for nearly four years in Newbury, where, according to Mr. J. J. Currier, in his recent "History of Newbury," he owned house and land on the southwest corner of Ordway's Lane, now Market Street, and "the way by the River," now Merrimac Street. This he sold January 12, 1666, and soon after removed to "Pascataway," now called Kittery, where he soon became a land-speculator and ship-owner, in partnership with Barefoot, who by that time had come down the river from Dover and lived sometimes in Kittery, sometimes at Great Island (now New Castle).

In Newbury, March, 1663, his landlord, John Emery, was fined for entertaining "Dr. Henry Greenland, a stranger, not having a legal residence in Newbury." This fine was remitted upon the petition of the selectmen and chief people of Newbury, "considering the usefulness of Mr. Greenland, in respect of his practice in our town." It was also stated by them, "That he was, by reason of his acquaintance with Capt. Barefoot, etc. inclinable to settle in the Country if he liked, and to make use of his practice of physic and chirurgery amongst us. But being as yet unsettled, and uncertain where to fix, until his wife, whom he hath sent for, did come, he was necessarily put upon it to reside near such patients as had put themselves into his hands for cure." It was at Newbury that some Puritan, shocked at Greenland's levity, reported that one night sitting at John Emery's inn-table, even before the long grace before meat was ended, he put on his hat and began to eat, saying, "Come, Landlord, — light supper, short grace." This jocose mood, together with other habits, brought him into quarrels; and in September, 1664, together with his friend Barefoot, he was convicted of an assault on William Thomas and Richard Dole, in a tavern at Newbury, — probably John Emery's.

Walter Barefoot, who seems to have been great-grandson of a famous Puritan minister in England, Ezekiel Culverwell, first appears in New England in May and June, 1657, as receiving assignment from James Chancellor, surgeon, and Robert Greenill, able seaman, of two tickets each for their wages in Cromwell's navy, — Greenill's as seaman and cook from September 1, 1654, to June 10, 1655, and Chancellor's as surgeon's mate and surgeon from September 17, 1655, to May 13, 1657. Possibly Barefoot came over in one of the vessels named (the

"Golden Falcon"), and that he also was a surgeon in the navy. The same may be true of Greenland; and this would account for their considerable medical knowledge, so evidently above the standard of New England at that time. Barefoot resided in Kittery awhile from the date named, and, November 16, 1658, he advanced to Captain Francis Champernown, a large landholder there, £130 sterling, and received from him a deed for five hundred acres of land and a house in Kittery. In this deed, and in a bond of August, 1660, Barefoot is styled "Captain," and in the bond, "of New England, merchant," — the giver of the bond being a Barbados merchant, Thomas Langley. August 6, 1661, Barefoot sold a house with thirty acres of land by the seaside in Kittery to S. Harbert, tailor, and soon after became a landholder and physician in Dover, New Hampshire. After Greenland's arrival at Kittery, in 1666, Barefoot bought of him one thousand acres on Spruce Creek, and about the same time two hundred acres near Champernown's Island, adjoining his earlier five hundred acres, which he bought of Colonel John Archdale, afterwards Governor of South Carolina, and a Quaker. In 1687, when Sir Edmund Andros, a political friend of Barefoot and Greenland, was about to confirm Barefoot's title to the thousand acres bought of Greenland, certain occupants of the Spruce Creek lands, — John Shapleigh, Enoch Hutchins, and others, declared to Andros by petition: —

"We your petitioners have purchased several parcels of land lying in Spruce Creek, at a place called Mill Creek in Kittery, containing near or about 1000 acres, and have possessed the same for a very considerable time, and have been at a vast charge and expense, and most spent their time and labor to improve the same, for their and the Country's benefit: whereas Capt. Walter Barefoot never made any improvement on the same, neither did he ever make any claim, as your petitioners ever heard of, till now; neither ever disturb or molest them in the possession and improvement of any part thereof."

It is probable that Greenland had bought under a dubious title, from the heirs either of Mason or Gorges, the original grantees of all that region; and that Barefoot, finding the title in dispute, bequeathed it to Greenland, in his will of October 3, 1688, to avoid perplexing his other heirs; for in that will he said: —

"My land at Spruce Creek, 1,000 acres, which I purchased of Dr. Henry Greenland, I devise to the said Henry Greenland."

It does not appear that this New Jersey heir ever laid claim to it; and the expulsion of Andros in 1689 probably prevented any adjudication in favor of his partisans. A descendant of Greenland, Mr. F. C. Cochran, of Ithaca, New York, now writes me that his ancestor, after leaving Maine in 1673, continued to live at Pascataway, New Jersey, until his death sometime in 1695. By his will written in 1694, he left property to two children, Henry and Frances, — the latter marrying Daniel Brinson, of Pascataway, October 8, 1681. She must therefore have been born as early as 1663, and perhaps before Mary Greenland left England. A second daughter, married to Cornelius Langfield, seems to have died before her father, as also did her mother, who was living in 1684. The son of Frances and Daniel Brinson was named Barefoot Brinson, in honor of Dr. Walter, and became high sheriff of Middlesex County, New Jersey. A descendant afterwards married into the English Penn family.

New Jersey proved to be as full of the fractious as Massachusetts had been, or New Hampshire; but Captain-Doctor Greenland came out "on top" this time. In November, 1681, during a dispute between Governor Carteret and the Council on one side, and the house of deputies on the other, "came in person to the house of deputies Capt. James Bollen, Capt. Henry Greenland, and Mr. Samuel Edsall; and . . . immediately declared that this pretended house of deputies be dissolved, and you are hereby dissolved," — the Doctor-Captain looking on and approving. Five years later, 1686, he recorded as magistrate a bond to stand by the agreement and decision of arbitrators in fixing a border line. So Greenland appears to have stood in honor during his latest years; while his and Barefoot's former friend in Massachusetts, Edward Randolph, was always censuring and quarrelling with the Jersey government.

It is likely, in view of the facts now stated, that the disfavor into which Dr. Greenland fell in Massachusetts was due to political animosities, arising partly out of the controversy over land-titles in Maine and New Hampshire, and partly out of the religious strife between the Puritans, the Church of England

men, and the Quakers. Barefoot never became a Quaker ; but both he and his sister, Mrs. Sarah (Barefoot) Wiggins, of Dover and Stratham, were staunch supporters of the Anglican church, though Puritans by descent ; and Greenland, very likely, like Major Shapleigh of Kittery, Colonel Archdale, Ralph Earle, and others bearing military titles in New England, became a Quaker after his banishment. The setting free of the Quaker women at Salisbury and Newburyport, while being whipped from Dover to Providence, in 1662, at the order of Major Waldron of Dover, was the work of Barefoot and Major, or Captain, Pike ; but Greenland and his friend and host, Emery, probably assisted in it. The life of the Greenland family, after leaving Maine, has been historically unknown hitherto, but it appears to have been respectable, and probably both they and the Barefoots were better people than the Puritans thought them.

It seems, by Mr. Cochran's researches, that Ezekiel Culverwell, of a celebrated Puritan family, married in 1598, in London (at the age of forty-four, and a widower with children), Mrs. Edward Barefoot, a widow, whose maiden name was Winifred Hildersham, and who had lived at Hatfield Broadoak, in Essex, before her marriage to Edward Barefoot, of Lamborne, in Essex, the seat of the Barfoots or Barefoots for a century or two. She was the half-sister, through her father, Thomas, and his wife, Frances Bladwell, of Rev. Arthur Hildersham, who in 1592 married Anne Barfoot, of Lamborne Hall, daughter of John Barfoot, and sister of Edward. This whole connection was stoutly Puritan, — Rev. Ezekiel Culverwell having a brother, Samuel, a famous preacher, and two sisters, one of whom married Laurence Chaderton, master of Emmanuel College, and the other married William Whitaker, master of St. John's College, Cambridge. From such a nest of Puritans came forth that odium of the New England Puritans, Walter Barefoot, — and possibly Henry Greenland, also, in whose family appears a Katharine, perhaps descended from Mrs. Katharine Barfoot, of Lamborn Hall, in the reign of Henry VIII. Ezekiel Culverwell's daughter, Sarah, married Thomas Barefoot, son of Edward, of Lamborn (born in 1586), and their son, John, seems to have been the father of Walter and Sarah, of New England. If so, Arthur Hildersham, an obstinate and imprisoned Puritan, was their great-uncle.

Mr. JAMES F. HUNNEWELL presented the following paper:

*Latest and Earliest Town Views.*

Let me present to the Society five views in Boston that are of interest and that should be in its collections.

Three of the views, on a fairly large scale, are photographs of the Harvard (Unitarian) Church in Charlestown, built in 1818, and now being much changed for business use. Here the Rev. Dr. George E. Ellis, formerly President of this Society, was minister from March 11, 1840, to June 13, 1869. An interior view shows an alcove and the pulpit as they were during the latter part of his ministry, and, at the left, the position of a wall-monument to his predecessor, the Rev. Dr. James Walker, who became President of Harvard. One exterior view shows the front and tower, of red brick, and the wooden gray steeple, the whole one of the best designs in its style in this region.

Another view, taken from Green Street, shows a curious and very uncommon feature, — that there were for the last half-century two steeples, one inside of the other. The frame, partly stripped, shows the outline of the steeple seen during that period; within it is seen the tip of the original steeple, short, round, and small, known by Dr. Ellis during the earlier part of his ministry. It was thought that an improvement could be made, and the newer steeple was built without disturbing the original. At the right, I may add, are three of the old trees in my garden, under which I played when a boy, and to-day flourishing.

The other two views are the fifth and sixth produced by the Iconographic Society, which is formed by ten members of the Club of Odd Volumes. These views complete the First Series of the former's publications. One of the views is of Faneuil Hall as it was in 1870; the other is of "The Old Corner Bookstore" as it was in its older days and the time of its greatest glory, in 1850. Both views are finely engraved by S. L. Smith, and the impressions are limited to 73 each, the plates being then destroyed, so that these engravings will remain not only among the finest ever made of Boston subjects, but also among the scarcest. All of these five views may even now be called scarce.



While presenting some of the latest local views as now given by process or plate, — that is, in current styles, — let me show a few of the earliest town views ever made, and the great contrast. I had thought of a paper on what might be called Primitive Town Views, but it would, perhaps, be out of the range of subjects treated here.

The earliest work giving such views on any great scale is a volume so large and heavy that I could hardly bring my copy here. It is, in sundry respects, one of the most remarkable volumes ever printed, and is now rarer than Eliot's Indian Bible, and is, it may be said, the first illustrated Universal History, — the "*Rudimentum Noviciorum*," by the great prototypographer of northern Germany, Lucas Brandis, Lubeck, 1475, and the first book there printed. Closely following it, was the "*Fasciculus Temporum*," a compendium of history from the Creation to the year of publication.

Let me first show the edition by Peter Drach, Speyer, 1477, giving views of Rome, Syracuse, and other cities among the earliest ever printed. Next, let me show the edition by Erhard Rodolt, Venice, 1481. On the verso of leaf 37 is a cut said to be "the first engraved view of Venice." The development from these beginnings to the plates by our Boston Iconographic Society, from the rudest to the finest, is worth observing.

Furthermore, this work is of interest in a modern Historical Society and elsewhere, showing, as it does, the popularity of history at a very early date in the lifetime of printing.

Within nine years, 1474 to 1483, there were at least ten editions, — seven of them in Latin, and one each in Dutch, German, and French, all in folio. The seven were by Terhoernen, Cologne, 1474; by Hoemborch, also there, 1476; by Veldener, Louvain, 1476; by Drach, Speyer, 1477; by Rodolt, Venice, 1481; by Kunne, Memmingen, 1482, and (said to be the "earliest book printed in Spain") 1480. The others were, in German, by Richel, Basle, 1481; in Dutch, by Veldener, Utrecht, 1480; and as the "*Petit fardelet des faits*," Lyon, 1483. Some things more than town views are shown by this list. Any historical work now published in as many places, countries, and languages within nine years would be considered a marked success, and to have interest and value.

Hon. SAMUEL A. GREEN read the following paper: —

*Washington Oak at Mount Vernon.*

In a letter from Washington printed in the Boston Evening Transcript, April 14, 1905, is an account of the planting of an oak last year, in the lawn near the west terrace of the White House, by President Roosevelt, assisted by Secretary Hitchcock, a member of his Cabinet. The letter goes on to say that the tree was a lineal descendant of a native American oak which overshadowed the tomb of Washington at Mount Vernon; and that acorns from this oak were sent to the Czar of Russia by Charles Sumner, while Senator from Massachusetts. The account furthermore stated that Mr. Hitchcock, who had previously been the American Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, had picked up a handful of acorns which he found under the tree, and sent them home.

From the seed then planted six or eight years ago there came up a few oak saplings, of which one was the tree set out in the grounds of the White House; and another was placed near its grandparent at Mount Vernon. In the interest of historical truth, I took the liberty to call the attention of Secretary Hitchcock to the fact that it was George Sumner, a younger brother of Charles, and not the Senator, who had given the acorn to the emperor. George Sumner was a member of the Historical Society, and his memoir, printed in the Proceedings (XVIII. 189-223), gives many details connected with this interesting episode. The incident may seem too trivial for serious notice, but a memorial tree, if it is to have any meaning, should be deeply rooted in truth and accuracy.

In answer to my letter Secretary Hitchcock sent me a courteous reply, which brings the history of the Russian tree down practically to the present time, as follows: —

SECRETARY'S OFFICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1905.

SAMUEL A. GREEN, Esq.,

Librarian, Massachusetts Historical Society.

MY DEAR SIR, — I am this morning in receipt of yours of the 18th, and thank you for calling my attention to the letter printed in the Boston Transcript of April 14th, wherein it is stated, on my authority, that Charles Sumner, while Senator from Massachusetts, sent to the Czar of Russia some acorns taken from a tree shadowing the tomb of

Washington, which statement you correct by referring me to a full account of the occurrence to be found in the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, September, 1880 (XVIII. 194), for which I also thank you.

In reply, I beg to say that I have obtained the volume above referred to, and have read with great interest the memoir of George Sumner, prepared by Mr. Robert C. Waterston, from which it would appear that the information heretofore given me to the effect that the acorns were sent by the late Hon. Charles Sumner to Russia was incorrect, but was deemed accurate by me in the absence of more detailed and specific information until the receipt of your letter this morning.

As the incident referred to has found a place in the records of the Massachusetts Historical Society, it may not be inappropriate to bring the story up to date.

While Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg, I inquired as to the location of an Oak tree which I had been informed had grown from an acorn which the Hon. Charles Sumner, while Senator of the United States, had sent by his brother to His Imperial Majesty, the Czar, the acorns sent by Mr. Sumner having been taken from a massive Oak shading the tomb of Washington at Mount Vernon.

The memoir of George Sumner, to which you have kindly referred me, now furnishes me, for the first time, with a correct statement of the incident, but I would correct one of its statements to the effect that this Oak was planted near the cottage of Peter the Great, whereas the acorn from which it grew was planted on what is known as "Czarina Island," which is included in the superb surroundings of one of the palaces of His Majesty, near Peterhof. Suspended from the tree is a brass tablet bearing a Russian inscription, the translation of which is as follows:—

The acorn planted here was taken from an Oak which shades the tomb of the celebrated and never to be forgotten Washington; is presented to His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of all the Russias, as a sign of the greatest respect.

By an American.

I was fortunate at the time of my visit, which was in the fall of 1898, in finding a number of acorns on the ground that had been dropped from this historic tree. Gathering a handful, I sent them home, and secured from the seed thus planted a few Oak saplings, two of which were sent here from St. Louis, in April, 1904, one of which was planted by President Roosevelt in the grounds of the White House near what is now the north gate of the eastern entrance opposite the Treasury building, April 7, 1904, while the other was planted by myself under the shadow of its grandfather at Mount Vernon. Owing to climatic conditions at the time of the planting of these saplings, both the one planted by the President in the White House grounds and the other planted at Mount Vernon failed to live; but on Friday last (April 14th)

I received from my home at St. Louis another of these saplings, and on that date, planted it in the place of the one that had been planted by the President. Altogether, of the acorns sent from Russia, five sprouted and produced young Oak saplings. Two of them I had sent last year to my cottage at Dublin, New Hampshire, and I am pleased to say are growing nicely. One of these two, I will take to replace the one lost at Mount Vernon, and thus perpetuate, both here in Washington, and at Mount Vernon, the historic association growing out of the Russian Oak of George Sumner which, as described in the memoir —

was a gift, simple and natural, accompanied by no courtly parade, whose whole worth consisted in its association with the memory of Washington;

to which I might add: And was accepted by an Imperial Sovereign who, with his successors and people, have shown a friendship for our Government and its people which should never be forgotten. On page 195 of the memoir, it is stated —

The acorns had been carefully planted near the summer palace, while, as a mark of special consideration, a position had been selected for it on the grounds where still stands the cottage once occupied by Peter the Great, and where it would be watched over with constant care;

the actual fact being that the tree above referred to that grew from this acorn is on Czarina Island, as above stated, and is not anywhere near the cottage of Peter the Great, which is on the banks of the Neva directly opposite the principal part of the City of St. Petersburg, and near the cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul.

Yours very truly,

E. A. HITCHCOCK.

Other remarks were made during the meeting by Messrs. WILLIAM R. THAYER, EDWARD H. GILBERT, FRANKLIN B. SANBORN, ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE, JOHN D. LONG, and GAMALIEL BRADFORD.